



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and twilight gray
Had in her sober livery all things clad.
P. L. iv, 598.

Fosse orizzonte fatto d'un aspetto.¹¹
Purg. xxvii, 71.

Now glowed the firmament
With living sapphire.
P. L. iv, 604.

battlements adom'd
Of living sapphire.
ii, 1049

Dolce color d'oriental zaffiro.
Purg. i, 13.

While thus he spake, th'angelic squadron bright
Turn'd fiery red.
P. L. iv, 977.

Di quel color, che per lo sole avverso
Nube dipinge da sera e da mane,
Vid'io allera (that is, at words of St. Peter) tutto il
ciel coperso.

Par. xxvii, 28.
A wilderness of sweets.
P. L. v, 294.

Ma di soavità di mille odori,
Vi faceva un incognito indistinto,
Purg. vii, 80.

And what surmounts the reach
Of human sense, I shall delineate so,
By lik'ning spiritual to corporal forms.
P. L. v, 572.

Così parlar conviensi al vostro ingegno
.....
..... e piedi e mano
Attribuisce a Dio, ed altro intende.
Par. iv, 40.

Therefore eternal silence be their doom.
P. L. vi, 384.
Non ragioniam di lor ma guarda e passa.
Inf. iii, 51.

So steers the prudent crane
Her annual voyage, borne on winds.
P. L. vii, 430.

E come i gru van cantando lor lai
Facendo in aer di sè lunga riga.
Inf. v, 46.

What seem'd fair in all the world seem'd now
Mean, or in her sunn'd up.
P. L. viii, 472.

Ella è quanto di ben può far natura;
Per esempio di lei beltà si prova.
La Vita Nuova, § xix.

The personification of the sun, turning suddenly his course, at the "tasted fruit" of Adam and Eve, "as from Thystean banquet (*P. L.* 688)" is like that of the river Arno,

11. Cf. also,—

Night's hemisphere had veil'd the horizon round.
P. L. ix, 32.

which, arrived at Arezzo, and disgusted at their currish character,—

"a lor, disdegnosa, torce il muso."
Purg. xiv, 48.

In *P. L.* x, 891, Eve is called "this fair defect of Nature;" so too an ugly body in the *Convito* iii, 4,—is said to be due to a *peccato della natura*. Venus in *P. L.* xi, 589 is "Love's harbinger,"—while in *Purg.* i, 19,—we find it spoken of as

Lo bel pianeta che ad amar conforta.

The description of storm and flood in *P. L.* xi, 737, 6. seems to show reminiscential or coincidental resemblances to Dante's famous description in *Purg.* v, 109 ff.

In conclusion, I may say that in writing this article my purpose has not been to prove in every case cited that Milton directly or indirectly borrowed from Dante, but simply to bring together what seemed to me more or less striking resemblances between the two poets. That Milton was influenced by Dante can, I think, admit of no doubt. The extent of this influence will be a matter of opinion on the part of those who examine the evidence in the case. My function has been to supply, as well as I knew how, the materials which may serve as a basis for such opinions.¹²

OSCAR KUHN.

Wesleyan University.

ARISTOTLE AND MODERN TRAGEDY.

THE fact that Aristotle was a scientist who took the whole field of knowledge for his province has become trite with repetition, so that it falls upon our ears as a meaningless phrase. Yet it is a truth which we must constantly bear in mind if we wish really to understand the meaning and the permanent value of his *Poetics*. For, in this little book, which preserves to us nearly all that we know of his æsthetic theory, Aristotle has the same pre-

¹² Lowell in a letter written at Whitby, points out what he considers a strong influence of Dante on Milton's versification, which he says he is convinced, was mainly modeled on the Italian and especially on the *Divina Commedia*. "Many, if not most of his odd constructions are to be sought there, rather than in the Ancients." *Letters of James Russell Lowell*, vol. ii, p. 386. This seems to me to be an exaggerated statement of the facts.

cise, logical point of view which pervades his scientific works. In the *Poetics*, which was never an exhaustive treatise, and in its present fragmentary form is almost entirely a discussion of tragedy, Aristotle is neither a pure theorist, forming from his own general ideas a set of rules meant to guide future dramatists; nor, on the other hand, a mere compiler of the practice of the Greek tragedians. He is primarily an inductive reasoner, basing his conclusions upon the forms of drama known to him. Without assuming even the greatest work to be perfect, he attempts, from the varied excellence of different tragedies, to discover the causes and necessary conditions of such excellence.

Since he is addressing an audience perfectly familiar with Greek literature, and ignorant of any other, Aristotle passes over without specific treatment the element in Greek tragedy which is its most important point of difference from the modern drama. Greek tragedy had its beginnings in religious rites; it continued, through all its history, to be represented at solemn public festivals; and it almost invariably chose its subjects from the national semi-religious myths. Thus it received a religious character, which permeates its very essence. Even in the plays of the sceptic Euripides, though the old Greek piety and seriousness are gone, the type of drama which they had created remains.

Of this religious drama, Aristotle gives the following familiar definition:

"Tragedy is an imitation of an action that is serious, complete and of a certain magnitude; . . . in the form of action, not of narrative; through pity and fear effecting the proper purgation of those passions."¹

Thus at the beginning of the *Poetics*, Aristotle assumes that pity and fear are the emotions proper to tragedy. Though he does not argue directly in support of this proposition, his illustrations, which are drawn from the greatest works of the Greek poets, show how it was obtained. Pity and fear, he continues, are best aroused by the spectacle of a great man, and one in general good, brought into

misery through some defect of his nature. To this highest type of tragedy belong the *Agamemnon* of Æschylus, and the *Edipus Tyrannus* of Sophocles. When we read, or see performed, such tragedies, pity arises in us for the hero, who suffers a punishment which, judged by human standards, is out of all proportion to his guilt. A tragic fear, or sense of awe, comes from the vision of a moral order under which such retribution is possible, or perhaps inevitable. By the excitation of such lofty passions our own purely human emotions are purged of disturbing elements, are deepened and purified. This tragedy, although it has an indirect moral effect, by the deepening of human feelings, is by its very nature, being addressed to the feelings and not the will, æsthetic rather than moral. By not assigning a direct moral purpose to tragedy, or to poetry in general, Aristotle departed from the traditional Greek point of view, and was not followed by the modern schools which looked upon him as their guide.²

It is, however, no exaggeration to say that the *Poetics* was for centuries the gospel of dramatic criticism. Aristotle retained his rule in æsthetics even longer than in science. He shared with other great teachers the fate of being misunderstood and misinterpreted, but was regarded with as superstitious a respect as any Father of the church. Dacier, in 1692, dismisses with scorn the suggestion of an Italian commentator that there might be a contradiction between the *Poetics* and the Bible. "As if Theology and Holy Scripture could ever be contrary to the sentiments of Nature upon which this judgment of Aristotle is founded."³ Seventy-five years later Lessing, a critic fundamentally opposed to the French classicism of which Dacier was an exponent, repeats essentially the same opinion. He charges the French school with misinterpretation of the work by which they attempted to justify their methods, but thinks the *Poetics* itself "as infallible as the *Elements of Euclid*."⁴

The interpreters of Aristotle, instead of seeking to understand the spirit of their

¹ *Poetics* vi, 2 (Butcher's translation). Though *fear* is apparently the only word that can be used here, Aristotle means rather a *sense of awe* than *fear* as we commonly employ the term.

² Butcher: *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, chap. v.

³ *La Poétique d'Aristote*, note 1 to chap. xiii.

⁴ Butcher, *ibid.* p. 354.

author, often busied themselves with petty details, and unwarranted expansion of hints given by him. Thus they devoted reams to discussing the unities of time and place, of which the last is not found in Aristotle at all, and the first is referred to only in a passing phrase. These unities, though important to a student of Aristototele's influence on the modern drama, are of small account in his own theory. And the unity of action, upon which Aristotle really does strongly insist, is with him no dry, formal principle. Aristotle makes the plot the first principle, or, as it were, the soul of tragedy.⁵ He even says, with an exaggeration perhaps conscious, that there may be tragedy without character, meaning probably without strongly individualized figures. The plot, he continues, must be complete in itself, and have an orderly development from beginning to end, so that no part could be omitted or displaced without injuring the effect of the whole. So a tragedy must not only have a single hero, but the acts of the hero must be united by some principle of unity.

Aristotle had before him no such tragedies as *King Lear*, in which a subordinate action aids rather than retards the development of the main plot. It would, therefore, be almost useless to speculate what opinion he would have held about them. In their form they do not offend against the spirit of his teaching.

Yet, in spite of the emphasis laid upon the plot, Aristotle is not indifferent to the importance of character in tragedy. "Character," as he expresses it, "holds the second place."⁶ So he pronounces, with manifest disapprobation, that the poets of his own time fail in rendering of character, evidently meaning that they confine themselves to reproducing conventional types. When taken in connection with his insistence upon the organic development of plot, these words show us that his ideal tragedy is one in which character and plot are inextricably blended. In such a play the characters of the actors, joined with their initial situation, give rise to the incidents of the plot, and the incidents, in their turn, bring out new manifestations of character, so that a single harmonious impression is created.

This ideal of Aristotle does not result from

⁵ *Poetics*, vi, 14.

⁶ *Poetics*, vi, 14.

any special peculiarity of the Greek drama: on the contrary, it is an expression of the universal Greek striving for unity and definiteness of effect. Although it is not attained by even the majority of the Greek plays, it nevertheless points to a difference between the Greek and the modern drama as wide as that between a Greek temple and a Gothic cathedral. It makes clear to us how far from Greek methods are whole divisions of modern literature. It at once condemns all works,—and their name is legion,—of which the primary aim is to exhibit character, or to set forth social problems. To speak more definitely, it offers a standard to which none of the Elizabethan plays, except the greater number of Shakspeare's and a few of Marlowe's and Jonson's, can be said to conform. When we try to call to memory a work by one of the minor Elizabethan dramatists, we cannot form a clear, definite idea at once of the plot and the characters. The actors rarely have the truth and elevation that makes them at once ideal figures and real men and women. Even when this condition is fulfilled, the plot depends rather upon external caprice than upon the character and original situation of the actors. Either the plot is constructed for its own sake, and then more or less conventional characters grafted upon it, as in the romances of Beaumont and Fletcher; or else it has a movement independent of the characters, merely designed to show them in new lights, as in the melodramas of Marston and Webster. The union and interdependence of plot and character needed for true tragic effect are always lacking. Shakspeare himself has given us one such play in *Troilus and Cressida*. There the whole interest is in the speeches and the character exhibited by them, while the plot is a wretched thing without beginning or end, or logical connection with the actors. Some whimsical critic may yet tell us that, in a passing mood of cynicism, Shakspeare mockingly adopted the faulty methods of his contemporaries, and wrote *Troilus and Cressida* to illustrate the following words of Aristotle: "If you string together a set of speeches expressive of character, and well-finished in point of diction and thought, you will not produce the essential tragic effect nearly so well

as with a play which, however deficient in these respects, yet has a plot and artistically constructed incidents."⁷

Other rules of Aristotle result from his limitation of the proper dramatic emotions to pity and fear. Probably this generalization, which lies at the very basis of his theory, is not universally applicable even to Greek tragedy. Certainly it is too narrow to express the whole truth about the modern drama.

Turning to English literature, as that most familiar to us, we see at the first glance that the character of the Elizabethan drama is radically different from that of Greek tragedy. To be sure, the English drama, like the Greek, had a religious origin; but in its later development it shows few traces of religious influence. In fact, from the time of the miracle plays until our own day, it has been unceasingly attacked on the ground of its immorality. The English dramatists, instead of being confined to a few time-honored myths, had absolutely free range in their choice of subject. While in Greece comedy and tragedy were kept apart both by their different origins and by the analytic instinct of the Greek race, which insisted upon sharply distinguishing its several literary types, in England they meet in the most intimate union. Thus the English drama has no such unity of form and conception as is found in the Greek. The result is that the emotions aroused by the English plays, though usually less intense than those which find expression in the Greek drama, are much more varied.

For a statement of the English idea of a play, we can not do better than to turn to Dryden. In the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy* we find a definition, which, though modestly termed a rude notion or description, may be fairly enough contrasted with Aristotle's formula for the Greek tragedy. A play, says Dryden, is "a just and lively image of human nature, representing its passions and humors, and the changes of fortune to which it is subject, for the delight and instruction of mankind." In order to prevent this from applying equally well to a novel or an epic poem, we must clearly add Aristotle's words: "in the form of action, not of narrative." Then, except

⁷ *Poetics*, vi, 12 (Butcher's translation).

that we might question, as Dryden himself does elsewhere,⁸ whether the element of instruction is necessary, this definition could hardly be improved. In it, as we see at once, there is no limitation of the dramatic emotions. In another passage, Dryden makes this fact more explicit. "All the passions, in their turns, are to be set in a ferment [by tragedy]; as joy, anger, love, fear, are to be used as the poet's commonplaces, and a general concernment for the principal actors is to be raised, by making them appear such in their characters, their words, and their actions; as will interest the audience in their fortunes."⁹

Only the most important instance of the general widening of emotion in the modern drama need be discussed. Not one of the surviving Greek tragedies is founded upon the love between a man and a woman, considered apart from any other relation between them. The nearest approaches to it occur, significantly enough, in the *Alcestis* and the *Hippolytus* of Euripides. But in the former case we have primarily the idea of wifely devotion, considered as a religious duty; in the latter, the adulterous and incestuous love of Phædra is regarded as a retribution sent by the gods upon the crimes of her house. When woman was regarded as an inferior creature, sympathetic handling of love was hardly possible. In later Greek literature, love increases in importance. It is, for example, one of the chief motives in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius. But it is only after Classic times that love, treated for its own sake, really becomes a leading subject of literature. Its development was due to Christianity and the German races. By the chivalric ideal through which it dominated mediæval literature, it gained an importance which it has never since lost. To speak only of Shakspeare, in England, it is the central interest in *Romeo and Juliet*, and *Antony and Cleopatra*; in France, it became the chief subject of a school which professed to follow the Classic tradition. The *Cid* of Corneille, which is distinguished among his greater tra-

⁸ "Defence of an Essay of Dramatic Poesy" (Vol. II, p. 295, of the Scott-Saintsbury edition).

⁹ "Heads of an Answer to Rymer," (xv, 382.) Dryden might also be cited in support of very different views. The passages quoted are taken on account of their happy manner of expression, not appealed to as authorities.

gedies by having love as its predominating passion, achieved a most brilliant success on its first production, and has always been the most widely read of its author's works. We are at once amused and instructed when we see Corneille, in criticising his most famous tragedy, admit that fear is not aroused by it, and just hesitate a doubt that the dictum of Aristotle, upon which he bases much of his critical writing, may after all be only imaginary.¹⁰ In Germany, Goethe made love a leading motive in the greatest poem of our own century. It is impressive to see how the story of Faust, which, in its original form, has a natural affinity with the old Prometheus myth, is given a wholly modern tone by the addition of the episode of Margaret. Yet more striking, though we here pass the bounds of the acting drama, is Shelley's transformation of the Prometheus myth itself. In *Prometheus Unbound*, by joining the element of love to a characteristic Greek legend, the poet produces an effect which appeals intensely to the modern imagination but which would be unintelligible to that of the Greek.

It is, then, almost absurd to claim that pity and fear are the only emotions that should be aroused by modern tragedy. More than this, they are not always found, even in the Greek plays, upon which Aristotle based his generalization. The great critic frankly recognizes this fact. Regarding pity and fear as characteristic only of the highest form of tragedy, he sets apart, as failing to produce them, four distinct types of tragic plot. Though his analysis may amuse those accustomed to the less direct and simple ways of modern criticism, it is neither trivial nor useless. According to Aristotle, the most fitting subject for tragedy is, as we have seen, the fall into adversity of a man good in general, but with some defect of character. Hence, those tragedies are defective which treat, 1. of the rise of a good man into prosperity; 2. of the fall of a bad man into adversity; 3. of the rise of a bad man into prosperity; 4. of the fall of a perfectly good man into adversity. It will repay us to scrutinize this classification carefully, and to inquire whether in each of the types called defective by Aristotle, there are not found some

works ancient or modern of which the force and beauty are universally conceded.

The first class comprises nearly all tragedies of a happy ending. These Aristotle condemns, because in their general outcome, while they satisfy the moral sense, they excite neither pity nor fear; so that the pleasure derived from them is proper rather to comedy than to tragedy. Here the critic expresses in an extreme form the Greek aversion to the mingling of literary types. Yet he significantly admits that, through the weakness of the spectators, such tragedies often meet with greater popular favor than those of the type which he himself approves. And some of the most famous Greek tragedies, as the *Prometheus Unbound* of Æschylus and the *Iphigenia in Tauris* of Euripides, which even Aristotle heartily admired, belonged to this so-called inferior class. Examples in modern literature are still more numerous. In English, we have among Shakspeare's works, *Cymbeline*, and—for the play is a tragedy in the ancient sense of the word—*Measure for Measure*. In French, we at once think of the *Cid* and *Cinna* of Corneille, and in German of Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell*, and Goethe's *Tasso*. But the greatest example of all is *Faust*, with its final solution by reconciliation and atonement.

The numerous Greek tragedies belonging to this class are alone sufficient to show the fallacy involved in Aristotle's definition. Aristotle has allowed to intrude into his dogmatic, systematizing method, a personal element, which at once gives it unity and confuses it. Seizing finally the characteristics of the Greek tragedies that appeal most to himself, he has formed from them a definition which he applies universally. He does not see that his definition will not include works like the *Iphigenia in Tauris*, which he himself praises. This is one of several indications that the *Poetics* was only a tentative work; that Aristotle had not formed, or at least has not handed down to us, a consistent theory of poetry.

Tragedies of the second class, depicting the fall of a bad man into adversity, are pronounced faulty by Aristotle for reasons readily understood. Though our sense of justice is satisfied, yet we do not pity a bad man, nor, since

¹⁰ "Discours sur la Tragédie."

we cannot fancy ourselves in his position, is fear inspired by his ruin. Yet, the hero may be of so grand capacities that we are elevated by the contemplation of his energy, and in his fall moved by the failure of splendid powers. Thus, the *Richard III* of Shakspeare, though we feel the justice of his defeat, makes us tremble by his fierce vigor. His mighty efforts in a wrong cause give us a new picture of the irony of life. The *Sejanus* of Ben Jonson is a poorer play of the same sort. In this division also, though usually treated with a mocking spirit very alien to tragic solemnity, is the story of Don Juan, called the most popular dramatic hero ever created. The greatest of all such heroes, though for obvious reasons he cannot be included in this discussion, would be the Satan of Milton. On the whole, though it is hard to find effective examples of this type of tragedy, the true explanation is, as usual, more general than that given by Aristotle. The reason lies simply in the difficulty of conceiving a hero, who, though wicked, will nevertheless command the sympathy of the audience.

The rise of a bad man to prosperity, according to Aristotle, a plot totally unfit for tragic effect, seems at first sight entirely indefensible. Yet, perhaps it is successfully employed in Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*. Certainly the hero of that play, though endowed with human qualities, is, by all ordinary standards, a bad man. But, after overcoming all his enemies, he dies at the summit of his power, with no shadow of remorse for his past life. The tragic conflict lies in the struggle of Tamburlaine against death. To the eye of other men, his life has been a complete success; to his own, it is a partial failure. The question is, whether we are compelled to accept the hero's point of view, instead of our own natural one. In any case, the play shows the power of a great poet to ennoble what seems to common-sense the most unpromising situation.

One plot condemned by Aristotle still remains; the fall of a sinless protagonist into misery. Here the critic need not have searched far to find a magnificent example against his theory. The *Antigone* of Sophocles, when confronted with a choice between obedience to human and divine law, chooses the latter.

She cannot be said to have sinned; rather she is destroyed by the very perfection of her nature.¹¹ The Greek may have seen in her doom a divine vengeance upon ancestral guilt; we see an instance of the baffling injustice that at times seems the dominant force in the world. Several modern plays, as the *Polyeucte* of Corneille, the *Britannicus* of Racine, and the *Julius Cæsar* of Shakspeare are of similar construction. One transcendent subject of this nature, repeatedly treated in modern art, has in the drama never fallen into the hands of a genius, but remained as the popular Passion Play.

Now, let us, last of all, ask ourselves what modern tragedies correspond to the type which Aristotle approves, the fall into misery of a good man through some defect of character. Immediately a number of examples force themselves upon our attention. In German literature, we at once remember the *Götz von Berlichingen* and *Egmont* of Goethe, and the *Wallenstein* of Schiller. When we turn to Shakspeare, we find that the greater part of his tragedies fall in this group. Such are *Romeo and Juliet*, *Coriolanus*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, and, most striking of all, the four masterpieces, *Macbeth*, *Othello*, *Hamlet*, and *King Lear*. This wonderful agreement in form of the greatest works of the greatest of dramatists cannot be an accident. Its identity with the typical Greek structure, as set forth by Aristotle, is surely a proof of the permanent value of the Greek drama, and of the keenness of Aristotle's insight into it.

Some general conclusions may without danger be formed from the failure and success of Aristotle's little book. Certainly no critic ever had a position more favorable for work. As a basis for criticism there existed a dramatic literature that has perhaps never, certainly not more than once, been equalled. And this Greek drama was characterized by a unity of spirit that made it peculiarly suited to serve as a foundation for a theory of poetics. On the other hand, Aristotle had a comprehensive knowledge and power of generalization not possessed by any critic since his time.

¹¹ I owe my example to Butcher. In fairness, it must be said that another view may be taken of Antigone's conduct, which would bring the play into the class approved by Aristotle.

The result is in some respects such as we might hope. The great systematizer gives us an interpretation of Greek tragedy which must serve as a foundation for all succeeding thought. His tests, when applied to dramas of which he could foresee nothing, are seen to be still rich in suggestion. No stupid pedant and rhetorician could have exerted such an influence upon men of genius in all succeeding times.

Yet many, perhaps the majority of modern readers, will feel an irresistible discontent with the whole spirit of the *Poetics*. We can be sure of this when we see the ceaseless misinterpretation to which its principles have been subjected. The book has never been accepted as a guide in its literal sense. Each dramatist who professed to follow it had made a compromise between his own ideas and the precepts of Aristotle. Without fear of false pride, it may be said that the present century has been the first to understand the true character of the *Poetics*. And it has done so only by overturning the traditional fame of the book as the gospel of dramatic criticism, and viewing it as the intelligent effort of a scientist to explain the Greek drama. When we take this attitude we see in Aristotle a lack of imagination and sympathy which keeps him from perfectly attaining even his conscious aim. A reader of the Greek tragedies, though he has his mind cleared and enlightened by the *Poetics*, feels that after all the formulas of the critic are powerless to explain the depth of undefinable emotion aroused by the plays themselves. And if the book fails fully to explain the nature of the simple, clear-cut Greek drama, it is much more inadequate to the interpretation of modern literature. Really it only suggests points of view, gives a definite, helpful method to our criticism.

Aristotle has undertaken a task almost as difficult as to make a science of human nature. His failure is but one more proof of the hopelessness of the effort to judge works of the imagination by standards of common-sense. No later attempt to found a science of criticism has come so near success as Aristotle's splendid failure.

GEORGE R. NOYES.

Harvard University.

NOTES ON MÆDÆVAL FRENCH LITERATURE.

I.

The Date of the Roman de Thèbes.

In his edition of the *Roman de Thèbes*, published in 1890 by the *Société des anciens textes français*, Léopold Constans concludes that the poem must have been composed about 1150, "plutôt avant qu'après." (*Thèbes*, vol. ii, p. cxviii). In his chapter on 'L'Épopée antique,' in Petit de Julleville's *Histoire de la Langue et de la Littérature françaises* he has modified his ideas somewhat, and would fix the date between 1150 and 1155 (*Hist.*, vol. i, p. 182). In this view he was doubtless influenced by Gaston Paris' remarks in a review of the *Lucas* (*Romania*, xxi, p. 285) and not by the discovery of any new facts which would bear on the subject. Yet there is a passage in the *Roman de Thèbes* itself to which Constans attached enough importance to annotate (*Thèbes*, ii, p. 340), but which he omitted, and perhaps for very good reasons, from the list of his arguments, which may throw some light on the subject. It is the following:

Apoignant vint Garsi de Marre
Et sist sor ferrant de Navarre:
Por proee ne por granz cous
N'ot tel el regne al rei Anfous
(4437-4440).

This Alphonso, Constans says in his note, was undoubtedly Alphonso VIII, King of Castille and Leon. There is no good ground for disputing this statement, since he was the only Alphonso who was prominent between 1130 and 1175, within which dates *Thèbes* surely must have been written. And Constans seems to be just as convinced of the truth of the inference drawn in the second sentence of his note, that Alphonso owed this mention to the marriage of his daughter, Constance, to Louis VII—a supposition which is at least probable, especially since no other contemporaneous ruler is mentioned in the poem. But this marriage took place, according to all authorities, in the year 1154, certainly not earlier than the spring of 1152, the date of Louis' divorce from Eleanor of Poitou. Now Con-